

# THE LIBERATOR.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY,  
AT THE ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE, 21, CORNHILL.

ROBERT F. WALLCUT, GENERAL AGENT.

All remittances are to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper as to be directed, (*post paid*), to the General Agent.

TERMS.—\$9 00 per annum, payable in advance; or \$2 50 at the expiration of six months.

Six copies will be sent to one address for ten dollars, if payment be forwarded in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS making less than one square inserted three times for 75 cts., one square for \$1 00.

Financial Committee.—FRANCIS JACKSON, ELI GRAY LORING, EDMUND QUINCY, SAMUEL PHILIBRICK, WESSELL PHILLIPS. [This committee is responsible only for the financial economy of the paper.]

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

VOL. XVII.—NO. 29.

## REFUGE OF OPPRESSION

From Brownson's Quarterly Review for July.

### THE ABOLITIONISTS.

As conductor, some years since, of the *Boston Quarterly Review*, we took frequent occasion to express our views of the Abolitionists; and though many changes have come over us, and we can hardly be recognized by our readers as the same man that we were then, our estimation of them remains unaltered, except that, if possible, we now hold them in still greater detestation. They are the worst enemies of their country, and the worst enemies, too, of the slave. They are a band of mad fanatics, and we have no language strong enough to express our abhorrence of their principles and proceedings. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that they have the sympathy of a large portion of the people of the Free States, and that in several of the Northern States, they are already powerful enough to make it an object for demagogues to bid for their suffrages. Both political parties pander to them. Even the anti-slavery party seems to count them; for it has appointed from this Commonwealth scarcely an individual to a prominent office in its gift, not selected from the Abolition section of its friends,—certainly, no one distinguished for his bold and resolute opposition to Abolition movements. In the Whig party, the tendency to Abolitionism, or to court the Abolitionists, is, perhaps, still more decided than in the Democratic party. In Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, the party, at least just before elections, is almost avowedly Abolitionist, and would be in this State, were it not for a few distinguished leaders, whose influence we are sorry to see daily declining. Young Whigdom in all the Free States, composed of young men and boys, not to say young misses, who are soon to be the Whig party itself, is virtually an Abolition party, and its leaders are nearly as far gone as Garrison, Phillips, Leavitt, and Abby Foster.

All the sects, if we except, perhaps, High Church Episcopalian, are either already carried away by the Abolition fanatics, or rapidly yielding to it. The great body of Unitarian ministers in New England, once a respectable and conservative body of men, exerting, indeed, a bad influence on religion yet highly commendable for political and social virtues, are almost to a man now mad and fanatical Socialists and Abolitionists. If some few yet hold out, they are timid, and without influence on the general action of the body of which they are members. Nearly all, the young men from Protestant theological seminaries, soon out-foxed, and, wherever settled as ministers, seek to enlist their congregations in the movement. Only the Clergy, which can be represented by no new moral or social question, which has nothing to learn from experience, and whose doctrines on all subjects are as yet undetermined and fixed, remains unaffected by the fanaticism around her, and pays no attention to the decisions of modern cannibals. \* \* \*

For ourselves, we adopt no extreme views on the question of slavery. We have no sympathy with the Abolitionists; we entertain not for a moment even one of their fundamental principles. Man, we are ready to maintain, may have property in man, a full right to the services of his slave; though no doubt over his soul, slavery is not natural to him, and to no one can be justified; there is nothing in slavery that necessarily prevents the slaveholder from being a true and pious Christian; and where the master is a true Christian, and takes care that his people are instructed and brought up in the true Christian faith and worship, slavery is tolerable, and for negroes, perhaps, even more than tolerable. Many of the laws of the slaveholding States are unwise, unwise, unjust, cruel, and disgraceful; a large body of the slaveholders are deeply censurable for neglecting to recognize and respect marriage among their people, and for bringing them up in atheism or heresy; but we have no sympathy with those who denounce them because they are slaveholders, and we have no reason to suppose that they cannot, in the moral, social, and religious sense, compare favorably with their brethren of the North; and, whatever repugnance we may feel personally, to the slave system, we are fully convinced that the greatest disservice they could do to their slaves would be to grant them immediate emancipation, which would be as cruel as for a father to turn his children out of the world, at a tender age, to take care of themselves, the great sinners.

These instances show much more strongly the selfish class legislation in the upper classes, than they speak against the habits of the lower. Whilst the upper classes are making laws really to centralize power in their own hands, enabling them to enter every man's house at their will and pleasure, on the ground of rendering it more healthy, they continue the window taxes, and shut out both light and air, and instruct their employers to get up reports against the habits of the people, and to avoid, in their suggested remedies, any advertence to themselves, the great sinners.

The buildings and the habits of the people had been formed by the taxes on light and air, and by the necessities which heavy taxation, induced by wars and destructiveness, engaged in, in the days of social and governmental ignorance, imposed upon the people; and government ought now to begin, by removing the tax on windows—that is, on light and air—and not before they did so, to employ men to go over the country, raising a cry against the habits of the people, and proposing to take arbitrary powers, and the centralization of these powers into the hands of government. This is too bad. But you, in America, have begun our system of indirect taxation, and the consequence will be the same in America as in Great Britain, if the system be continued as long.

The way to prevent wars, or one war, is, to have a graduated scale of direct taxation upon property, increasing the ratio as the income of the man increases, except what they arrogate to themselves. Whatever their avowed objects, they are engines destructive of all true liberty. They are formed for and against every thing, and usurp control over the greatest public interest. Already have they become in the so-called Free States nearly intolerable. They are everywhere; they annoy us in our dormitories and uprising, in our eating and drinking, in our sleeping and waking. They overawed juries, they make the judge hesitate in his charge, and render the impartial administration of justice nearly impracticable. The magistrate fears to encounter them, and must obtain their protection before venturing to discharge his duties. If we yield to them on one point, we must on another—say, the law from their dictation on one occasion, we must of all occasions, and hold our property, our liberty, and our consciences only at their mercy. Let us break up to-day the legal order of the country in reference to slavery at their bidding, and to-morrow we must do it in reference to some other question, next day to still another. All seems then is gone. We are at the mercy of a wild, infatuated, and fierce multitude. The evils of negro slavery are but the dust in the balance with the evils we should then experience. No, never trample on law and constitutions in obedience to the mandates of self-constituted and irresponsible associations, which no well-ordered state can safely tolerate. A thousand times better is it to be the slave of the most brutal master, than to come under their lawless and fanatical sway.

Others will hardly less mad, seek to obviate the difficulty by dissolving the Union. But the dissolution of the Union would be the dissolution of American society itself. Remove the pressure of the Union, and the States would fall to pieces. Their strength as well-ordered States, is in the Union, let them resume the exercise of all their powers as independent sovereignties and war, revolution, and strife would almost instantly follow. They would soon become hostile to each other, and bitterly at odds in their hostility in proportion to the intimacy of their former mutual relations. The States would soon reduce the smaller to the condition of conquered provinces, and oppression would become universal.

The external evils would be insatiable; but the internal evils, those which would spring up in the bosom of the State itself, would almost infinite.

constitutions, especially in the Northern, Middle, and Western States, would stand. The insubordination of one people are so great, that nothing would remain permanent and fixed, but change itself.

The reverence for law is already scarcely strong. The reverence for law has nearly disappeared; loyalty is a word of bad meaning; and permanent institutions are held to be de-



OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD--OUR

BOSTON, FRIDAY,

YOUTH, JULY 16, 1847.



COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND

17 All men are born free and equal—with certain natural, essential, and unalienable rights—among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

17 Three millions of the American people are in chains and slavery—held as chattels personal, and bought and sold as marketable commodities.

17 Seven thousand infants, the offspring of slave parents, kidnapped as soon as born, and permanently added to the slave population of Christian, (i.) Republic, (C.) America every year.

17 Immediate, Unconditional Emancipation.

17 Slaveholders, Slave-traders and Slave-drivers are to be placed on the same level of infamy, and in the same abominable category, as kidnappers and men-stealers—a race of monsters unparalleled in their aspersion of power, and their despotic cruelty.

17 The existing Constitution of the United States is a covenant with death, and an agreement with hell.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!

J. BROWN VERRINTON, PRINTER.

WHOLE NO. 863.

## COMMUNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

At a meeting of the British Branch of the Evangelical Alliance, held in Edinburgh in May last—

Captain Trotter read a document, signed by a number of clergymen and others in London, relative to the resolution lately adopted by the Conference at Manchester, with regard to slaveholding. The communication stated, that the resolution referred to had caused the dissentients much regret and anxiety, and in a spirit of humility, faithfulness, and love, they desired to lay before the Conference their objections to it. They objected to it, first, in taking up a subject, which, however important, was wholly extraneous and under discussion, and that the Alliance would thereby involve itself in the discussion of a question with which it had, and should have, no concern. Second, that while they deeply deplored, in common with the Alliance, the sin and enormous evils connected with slavery, they thought that a wide distinction should be drawn between the voluntary upholder of that system, and one who, from circumstances over which he might have to contend, became possessed of slaves, or property including slaves. Third, and above all, because their deep regard for the form and authority of Scripture compelled them to object to the introduction of grounds of exclusion, which they believed were not warranted by the plain Word of God, and which would have shut out from the Alliance one whom an inspired Apostle addressed as a brother dearly beloved. The memorialists also begged to express the fears they entertained as to the effect of the resolution upon the minds of their American brethren, whom they had so recently invited to cross the Atlantic to join them upon a purely doctrinal basis. With the expression of their solemn conviction, which they repeated might be entered upon the minutes of the Conference, and transmitted to the other Divisions of the British Organization, they begged the Conference to accept of the advocacy of its doctrines and its measures?

Again the Eng. says, it will neither support nor oppose Gerrit Smith.

Meanwhile remember with grateful feeling the Philanthropists of England of a past day, and honoring their noble dead, let us not be so forgetful nor so culpable, as to forget the Abolitionists of our own country, of a past day and of the present. Our deceased friend set us a noble example in this respect. Of this country, Abolitionists of these times were his friends, and such alone. Let us be true now, in our own day and peril, to these benefactors of our race, and friends of man. Why should we wait until they have cast off this mortal coil, and become clothed upon with immortality, to greet them and their memories on the shores of eternity, when the need of praise, and the thrilling tones of gratitude, are now their due; and when too our beaming eyes and thankful utterances may serve to cheer and animate them, amid their sweatful toil and their imminent dangers!

A more ardent, devoted, unselfish set of men the world hath never seen. Such manifestations of philanthropy, such tokens of love, such displays of kindness to the lowly and the subject; have rarely been equalled amid all the histories of goodness which time hath ever recorded on her ample page. Their disinterestedness is equal to their other virtues. It is almost in vain we look among them for the intrusions of selfish purpose or vaunting ambition. Their exhibitions of self-sacrifice, and of fearless, hearty zeal—their demonstrations of brotherhood and equality, are really touching and subduing. Honored and revered be these benefactors of our race, and friends of man. Why should we wait until they have cast off this mortal coil, and become clothed upon with immortality, to greet them and their memories on the shores of eternity, when the need of praise, and the thrilling tones of gratitude, are now their due; and when too our beaming eyes and thankful utterances may serve to cheer and animate them, amid their sweatful toil and their imminent dangers!

What so very extraordinary in this as to deserve capitals, or even italics? The discussion was thorough, the mind of the Committee decisive. What is there in all this to justify the charge upon one member of the committee, of being 'arbitrary' and of setting aside 'ten Liberty Editors'? Why not make the charge upon all the seven of the committee, each of whom is as decided as the Editor of the Emancipator?

But the concluding remarks of the article, furnish to our own mind the key to the whole matter. 'We shall throw not a single obstacle in the way of the meeting of a Liberty Convention *at any time*.' Indeed! and is that all the help we are to have from this great national paper, established by *Liberty Party* men, upon *Liberty Party* funds, for the advocacy of its doctrines and its measures?

Again the Eng. says, it will neither support nor oppose Gerrit Smith.

Meanwhile he says, 'We feel disposed to retire from these divisions.' Very well, no one can complain of this; but if so, we entreat you to retire from the Editorial Chair which was placed for you by the hands of *Liberty* men, and the funds contributed by them to advocate their principles. If you have made up your mind to wait for Thomas Corwin or any other whig to come out on the Wilmett proviso, and then go with Mr. Giddings and Mr. Hanlin for him, then say so. But we solemnly protest against this arguing for a postponement till Spring of the *Liberty Convention*, when you seem to have no purpose of being guided by its action, either in Spring or Autumn.

'We do not now view it as a matter of much importance—that is, having a Convention at all. And why? Simply because Mr. Gerrit Smith will not decline the nomination of the *Macedon Lock*. Now we have to say on this subject, what Captain Trotter read in the communication, is equal to the effect of the resolution upon the minds of their American brethren, whom they had so recently invited to cross the Atlantic to join them upon a purely doctrinal basis. With the expression of their solemn conviction, which they repeated might be entered upon the minutes of the Conference, and transmitted to the other Divisions of the British Organization, they begged the Conference to accept of the principles of that union, in which they believed the Spirit of God to have joined them. Captain Trotter then moved that the communication be entered upon the minutes of that meeting.

Mr. Clark (Baptist) seconded the motion.

The communication was signed by the following gentlemen:—Robert C. L. Bevan, Esq.; Lombard Street; Hon. A. Kincaid, Pall Mall, East; Hon. Wm. Cooper, Admiralty; Rev. Joseph T. Parker, M.A., Kensington; Rev. Owen Clarke, Pentonville; J. D. Paul, Esq., Temple Bar; Rev. C. Hargrove, St. John's Wood; Rev. A. L. Gordon; J. W. Alexander, Esq.; E. A. Stevenson, Esq.; Rev. J. M. Soulé, Battersea; Captain Trotter, Durhan Park; J. Foster, Esq., Stamford Hill; G. Meek, Esq., Russell Square; G. J. Morris, Esq., Hampstead.

Mr. Bickersteth said, that while he was convinced it was the duty of the Conference to pass that resolution at the time when it was adopted, and that it had been attended with many blessed effects, he felt that the communication was so beautifully written, and in so excellent a spirit, that whatever might be the difficulty of entering it upon the minutes, it formed a guide for the composition of similar documents. It showed them the mode of relieving the consciences of their beloved brethren who did not entirely concur with them, might yet be such that they could heartily and faithfully join with them in works of kindness. He concurred in the motion.

Mr. M'Ilwaine said he never rose under feelings of greater repulsion than at that time; but he felt constrained to do it, by remaining silent he expressed approval of the document. (No, No.) He would move, as an amendment, that it be not entered upon the minutes, as he felt that it opened up a most serious question in connection with the subject of slavery, which was not then before them. (No, No.)

Mr. Bignold said that ample opportunities were afforded by other means for the circulation of the document than the Evangelical Alliance, and he felt it would be a bad precedent, if, after having transacted the ordinary business before them, a subject of that immense importance, which had caused so much anxiety and so much distress in the minds of many members, should be attempted in any way to be brought before them, and made the subject of discussion.

A discussion on the point of order in the introduction of the subject then took place, in which Captain Trotter said that the memorialists merely desired, similar publicity in their dissent as was given to the resolutions which caused it.

Mr. Bevan said that the minutes of the Conference did not contain any of the pleadings upon the resolutions, nor any of the reasons which led to its adoption, but simply the conclusion which was arrived at. The document before them contained the reasons of the non-concurrence of the parties; but he would suggest, that if the fact of their non-concurrence were intimated in the minutes, it would be an equal measure of justice, and would enable them to arrive at a harmonious conclusion. He would propose that the minute should be to that effect, that Captain Trotter read and laid upon the table a communication from several brethren, expressing their non-concurrence, on various grounds, in the resolution of the Manchester Conference on the subject of slavery, but expressing also their continued attachment to the principles of the union, and their determination still to adhere to the organization.

Dr. Candlish said that he could not give in to the principles, that members of the Alliance were not to be at liberty at a subsequent meeting to exonerate their consciences by putting in reasons of dissent. He was quite aware that there might be a technical rule, limiting that right to the existing meeting at which the cause of dissent was passed, yet his own impression decidedly was, that it would be better to reconsider it, with a view to give a larger scope in that direction. It appeared to him, that the resolution of the Manchester Conference was not raised at all, the question simply being as to how the particular document before them ought to be dealt with.

Captain Trotter expressed his acquiescence in the minute proposed by Mr. Bevan, which was unanimously adopted, and the matter terminated.

During the time that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church (New School) met in Cincinnati, a new church was formed with the title as above. It adopted the Confession of Faith, and Catechism of the Westminster Assembly, with a number of resolutions, among which are the following:

'No person holding slaves, or advocating the rightfulness of slaveholding, can be a member of this body.'

'That no church, presbytery, or synod, tolerating slaveholders, or the advocates of slaveholders, in its communion, can be a constituent part of this body.'

'Any three regularly ordained ministers, in good and regular standing, may constitute themselves into a Presbytery by adopting this constitution, and so become a part of this church.'

'Any three Presbyteries or more, may constitute a Synod.'

The Presbyteries, when they have been increased to the number of fourteen, may constitute a General Assembly.'

Rev. John Rankin acted as Moderator, and preached the introductory sermon. We understand that the members, at present, are composed chiefly of those within the bounds of the Ripley Presbytery.

## BOSTON OLIVE BRANCH.

Mr. EDITOR—I see, by a late number of Rev.

Thomas F. Norris's Olive Branch, that its editor has not yet ceased heaping the most vulgar and shameful abuse upon FREDERICK DOUGLASS, and through him, the editor of the Liberator, George Thompson of England, &c. What does the Rev. editor think to gain by such a course? A few more Southern

and Eastern evils would be insatiable; but the internal evils, those which would spring up in the bosom of the State itself, would almost infinite.

constitutions, especially in the Northern, Middle, and Western States, would stand. The insubordination of one people are so great, that nothing would remain permanent and fixed, but change itself.

The reverence for law is already scarcely strong. The reverence for law has nearly disappeared; loyalty is a word of bad meaning; and permanent institutions are held to be de-

reputable.

And, my friends, let us not suffer the rich instructions, and the massive treasures made available to us in the lives of Clarkson, and all other such great

men, to be buried in oblivion.

I recollect how the Olive Branch, nearly two years

ago, heaped shameful abuse upon Mr. Douglass, calling him a 'miserable negro,' &c., because he was impudent to speak on board the steamboat going to England, and gave way to that impetuosity at the request of the Captain; and how the Olive Branch also, abused the Captain in consequence, and warned the public against patronizing that boat. A writer in the Liberator soon after closed an article, by saying that he considered that the ability, moral honesty, Christian grace, propri

From the London Inquirer.  
ON THE PRESENT POSITION OF ENGLISH  
UNITARIANS,  
IN REFERENCE TO THE AMERICAN SLAVERY QUES-  
TION.

To the Rev. Edward Tugard, Secretary to the British  
and Foreign Unitarian Association.

MR DEAR SIR.—The observations made by some of the speakers, during the long and warm discussion upon American Slavery, which occurred at the late Annual Meeting of the Association, held at Hackney, on the 26th ult., lead me to think that the subject has not been examined into by many of our friends, and I hope you will allow me the favor of addressing to you, as Honorary Secretary of the Association, a few remarks upon the present position of English Unitarians in reference to this question.

I will not make any comment upon the propriety or irrelevance of the debate that occurred at Hackney. The Inquirer of the 29th ult. furnishes an able report of all that took place, so that those members who did not attend the meeting may form their own opinions of the proceedings. I am, however, anxious that the reason should be understood why we ought to be prepared for a re-agitation of the subject at any future anniversary, when allusion is made to our Unitarian brethren in the United States. Indeed, it does not seem improbable that, with our increasing insight into the character and the supports of American slavery, some of our members will feel it a duty to bring the matter forward, irrespective of any other reference to American Unitarians.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the “middle passage,” and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarian ministers visiting this country will altogether shun inquiry into their previous course on the Slavery question.

One gentleman, at the Hackney meeting, vouches for the Anti-Slavery sentiments of Dr. Parkman, whose condemnation of the Abolitionists, and whose inaction in the Emancipation movement, had been adduced as proofs of his little interest in the welfare of the slave. I trust the defence is well founded; yet should Dr. Parkman again come to England, he must be prepared, to be called upon by many to show in what way he is helping on the cause of freedom, before a cordial welcome would be generally extended to him. If Dr. Dewey were to not receive that unanimous invitation to the pulpits of our ministers, which he met with formerly; and that, in our social circles, he would be held in diminished estimation. Such sentiments and conduct towards those whose society is most gratifying to us, and whom we have been accustomed highly to appreciate, may appear to you and to other friends both liberal and uncalled for. Most deeply do I regret the circumstances which have occasioned this painful change. But it will be wise for us to view the facts as they really exist; and I have little or no doubt that, before the next anniversary of our Association comes round, these sentiments, in reference to Unitarian ministers from America, will have gained much ground in our body. The current of anti-slavery feeling and information has set in too strongly to be stemmed by such considerations as were opposed to it at our late meeting. Zealous as we are, and I trust shall continue to be, for the spread of what we believe to be Gospel truth, there are many in our ranks who will be on the watch, that, while cherishing our Unitarianism, we may not forgetful of our Christianity.

With such facts full in their view, it is not to be wondered at, that however much the American Abolitionists differ among themselves upon the mode of carrying out their anti-slavery purposes, there is one point upon which they are unanimous,

namely, that these evils, and all the others connected with slavery, owe their continuance to the religion of the country—that is the responsibility and support given by the Ecclesiastical bodies of their land, which maintains slavery. Even bishops and other ministers are frequently holders of slaves, and all the important lay-offices in the church in the Southern States are often filled by slave-owners. The Abolitionists agree in maintaining, that, instead of the sanction thus given to this iniquity, ministers of the Gospel were to speak out against the national sin as its enormity demands, (instead of being silent upon it, or calling the Scriptures to furnish arguments in its defense,) slavery would immediately terminate.

Upon those religious bodies in the United States, men, women and children are sold to benefit theological seminaries—they are sold to purchase communion-plate—their bodies are sold to procure Bibles, from which their souls are allowed to receive no benefit! The Bible too is brought forward to prove the lawfulness and desirability of this system; while Ecclesiastical Synods have decided, that, in the case of slaves, some of its sanctions may be dispensed with, and especially that the marriage vow is not binding.

With such facts full in their view, it is not to be wondered at, that however much the American Abolitionists differ among themselves upon the mode of carrying out their anti-slavery purposes, there is one point upon which they are unanimous, namely, that these evils, and all the others connected with slavery, owe their continuance to the religion of the country—that is the responsibility and support given by the Ecclesiastical bodies of their land, which maintains slavery. Even bishops and other ministers are frequently holders of slaves, and all the important lay-offices in the church in the Southern States are often filled by slave-owners. The Abolitionists agree in maintaining, that, instead of the sanction thus given to this iniquity, ministers of the Gospel were to speak out against the national sin as its enormity demands, (instead of being silent upon it, or calling the Scriptures to furnish arguments in its defense,) slavery would immediately terminate.

Upon those religious bodies in the United States, men, women and children are sold to benefit theological seminaries—they are sold to purchase communion-plate—their bodies are sold to procure Bibles, from which their souls are allowed to receive no benefit! The Bible too is brought forward to prove the lawfulness and desirability of this system; while Ecclesiastical Synods have decided, that, in the case of slaves, some of its sanctions may be dispensed with, and especially that the marriage vow is not binding.

Thus, then, the case appears to stand. The religious bodies of America, by their direct support of the system, or by their refusal to oppose it, are the ‘bulwarks of American Slavery.’ The Abolitionists of all parties call upon the Churches of Great Britain, not to sanction their particular schemes for emancipating the slave, but to aid them in awakening the consciences of their countrymen to the sinfulness of their position; and they tell us that we cannot so effectually promote this object as by appeals from the various Christian denominations of one country, to those holding the same opinions in the United States. The Unitarians of America have less connection with Slavery than other religious bodies, owing to the comparative smallness of their numbers; still it is clear that, to some extent, they share in the guilt of giving respectability and support to the institution which condemns three millions of their fellow-men to bodily degradation, and to mental darkness. It is, then, to be wondered at, if those English Unitarians who consider American Slavery to be a sin of the deepest die, and who believe that their brethren in the United States either give it a direct sanction, or do not employ the power which their intelligence and moral position gives them in openly opposing it, should desire to avail themselves of every suitable opportunity of urging the Unitarians of America to exhibit, in their efforts to abolish Slavery, the influences of that pure Christianity by which they profess to be guided?

I am not undertaking to point out the fittest mode of addressing our friends on the other side of the Atlantic upon the subject. My object is to show that we have this work to do, and that the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association must not be surprised if many of its members will not allow the question to be passed unnoticed in any future intercourse they may officially hold with the American Unitarian Association.

I rejoice in the conviction, that the Unitarians of Britain have not been altogether supine in this Christian cause. The hundred and ninety ministers who, in 1843, saw it to be their duty to urge their Trans-Atlantic brethren to increase exertion in behalf of the slave, did great credit to our body, furnished a valuable example to other religious communities, and elicited a strong protest from a hundred and seventy-three Unitarian ministers of America against Slavery. Though from both the English and American Address, respected and influential minister withheld names that would have done honor to the documents, as well as to the signers, the measures was one of great value to the anti-slavery movement. It afforded much encouragement to the noble band of Abolitionists in America, and received from them the warmest acknowledgments.

It is not by hard names and vituperation, that intelligent and conscientious men in America are to be driven into seeing the line of their duty with other eyes than their own; but I cannot believe that earnest, affectionate, Christian appeals to the Unitarians of the United States, to re-view their position with respect to this solemn question, will pass by them unheeded. I am aware they maintain that there is a total inability on our part to enter into all the circumstances of their situation sufficiently to form a correct judgment of what they ought to do. I believe, however, that, removed as they are from their influences, their prejudices, and their temptations, we can discern more clearly than they can, the pointings of their duty.

In conclusion, I am much inclined to hope that one of the effects of the late discussion will be, to induce some of our friends who have hitherto taken little interest in American Slavery, and the efforts of the Abolitionists, to direct their attention to the subject, to discriminate how far individuals from the United States are entitled to our esteem on account of the course they have pursued in reference to slavery, and we are bound to be cautious and candid in our judgments. When, however, we find an American visiter severely censuring the Abolitionists for want of prudence and for intolerance—professing an abhorrence of slavery, but making excuses for the slaveholder—condemning the sin, but not admitting that there is any sin—when we ascertain, that while denouncing himself an anti-slavery man, he has done nothing in favor of the slave—when he maintains that there are peculiar circumstances in the political, professional or social position of himself and others which we cannot understand, but which render the agitation of the subject undesirable, and imposes the ‘duty of silence’—that its discussion will prove injurious to the interests of this or that sect, and instead of accelerating, will retard the emancipation of the slave—when we meet with a person adopting this line of argument, we may feel pretty certain that his understanding or his conscience wants light on the slavery question.

The ‘bigotry,’ ‘intolerance,’ ‘violence,’ ‘unchristian judgments,’ &c. &c. of the American abolitionists, furnish a fruitful theme of condemnation upon both sides of the Atlantic. I will not undertake their excusal; but before we join this indiscriminate censure, it will be well for us to make ourselves acquainted with their conflicts, their trials, their sacrifices, their unselfish devotion to the cause of human suffering, and especially with the obstacles opposed to them by the ministers and religious organizations of their country.

But occasions will occur, on which there will be no difficulty as to the appropriate line of our conduct. The American Unitarian Association, at the present moment, furnishes a good illustration of the circumstances under which a sister country in Britain has, in my view, a right to offer remonstrance on the slavery question in any official communication that may be held with it. The first name on its List of Officers, as given in the Boston ‘Unitarian Annual Register’ for 1847, is that of the Rev. Dr. Dewey; and the last name of the fifteen Vice Presidents, is Dr. Whitridge, of South Carolina. When Dr. Dewey was in England, in 1843, he asserted that he had been for many years a member of a secret society for the abolition of slavery, and considered there was much injustice in its being thought (as was inferred from his mode of reasoning on the subject) that he was but lukewarm in

the cause of the slave. And yet, on his return to the United States, he published an Address on ‘American Mores and Manners,’ in which he speaks of the colored race as a ‘despised minority,’ separated from the white inhabitants by impassable physical, if not mental barriers—an association made with the full knowledge of an almost infinite race of descendants of negroes at the South, the offspring of iniquity. And then, as a remedy for the evil of having a sixth part of his countrymen with skins differently colored from the soil of their birth (of inhabiting which, their right is as strong as Dr. Dewey’s) to distant countries.

Such are the sentiments of the President of the American Unitarian Association. And then, with regard to Dr. Whitridge, one of the Vice Presidents, nothing need be said of him that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

Now, had these facts been fully known and considered, I can hardly suppose that some of the speakers at our meeting would have taken such low views of the slavery question as their observations indicated.

One of our friends thought it inconsistent that, having heretofore desired to fraternize with the American Unitarian Association, and to pass resolutions of sympathy towards our brethren in the United States, we should now all at once hesitate in expressing these sentiments. The answer is simple. We have now more light, and a clearer perception of duty. There was a time, in the memory of many of us, when merchants—who purchased human cargoes on the coast of Africa, and subjected them to the horrors of the ‘middle passage,’ and then sold the survivors, to finish a miserable existence in cruel slavery—were considered in our social circles to be as respectable as those whose capital was engaged in purchasing the ordinary necessities of life. But, in the present day, who that is not even of an indirect connection with this infamous traffic would tolerate in society?

It is now too late to expect that American Unitarians will not be surprised to find that the simple statement that he is himself a holder of slaves.

most must answer, no! All can then rejoice together, and hold a universal jubilee.

I do hope that the abolitionists will encourage Douglass to proceed, and not give way to selfish expedient. It appears that the way is now opened for him to proceed. It appeared to be his inclination at first, and the opinion of his English friends—then why draw back? Why put the hand to the plow, and look back? Let there be no holding back those who are able and willing to proceed in such a good cause as this, but encourage them to go ahead.

The chief reason for the abandonment of the scheme of publishing said paper you give is, that there are already four papers conducted by colored men, but on looking into the list of them, I find not the least Convention at Princeton, that the people of Worcester North were dead; but this is not true of such towns as Shirley, Harvard, Lancaster, Sterling, &c.; for, surely, they have never yet had an anti-slavery existence—they are yet to be born into the light of truth. Who is better qualified than Mr. Brown to give them the needed light? And if he can succeed in reaching the minds of the people, I presume the cause will reap a rich harvest of his fruits; for there is wealth and intelligence enough in these places, to accomplish a great work.

In connection with this, I wish to say something relative to the labors of the women for the promotion of the cause. Learning that S. S. Foster would be at Princeton on the fourth and fifth instant, I sent him a line, asking him to urge the subject upon the attention of the convention; which he did, much to the satisfaction of all who heard him. Unfortunately, but few heard him, especially those who most needed it, as his chief remarks on this point were made at the evening session, when the largest part of the friends from out of town had left for the evenings and on Sunday.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Rev. Elmer Hewitt, and Samuel Dyer was appointed Secretary pro tem. On motion, a committee on nomination of officers was chosen, consisting of Bourne Spooner, Edward E. Bennett, and Lewis Ford, who subsequently reported the following list of officers for the ensuing year:

President—Elmer Hewitt, of Hanson.  
Vice Presidents—Seth Sprague of Duxbury, Bourne Spooner of Plymouth, Samuel Dyer of Abington, Melzar Sprague of Hanson, Daniel Otis of Scituate.

Secretary and Treasurer—Henry H. Brigham of Abington.

Managers—Lewis Ford and Briggs Arnold of Abington, Mrs. Joshua Perry and Edward Y. Perry of Hanson, and Rufus Bates of Hanover.

Bourne Spooner and Lewis Ford were chosen a committee on finance.

The following resolution was offered by Richard Thayer:

Whereas, the people of this Commonwealth propose to commemorate the achievement of American Independence, by appropriate public ceremonies, on the 5th instead of the 4th of July, because the latter comes on what they regard as peculiarly the Lord's day; therefore,

Resolved, That their conduct, in this respect, is a libel on the sentiment which obtains among them, that God was in a peculiar sense the author of that achievement.

The following resolution was moved by Loring Moody, and, after a spirited discussion by Messrs. Moody, Remond, Douglass, Whiting, Pillsbury, and Morton, was laid on the table:

Resolved, That the slaves in this nation have far greater cause to rise in forcible resistance to their masters, and obtain their liberty by planting their foot on the prostrate form of their oppressors, than the fathers of this republic ever had, under the colonial bondage of Great Britain.

The following were offered by Parker Pillsbury, and, after a long and earnest discussion, adopted:

Resolved, That the present declining state of American Atheism, so long sustained by the name of Christianity, is cause of rejoicing to every friend of truth and humanity; inasmuch as, under it, and by it, millions are enslaved, multitudes of Indians and Mexicans are murdered and plundered of their lands, polygamy is endorsed and practised, and every description of abomination is or may be perpetrated, under the specious doctrine of 'organic sin,' revealed and published by our Doctors of Divinity.

Resolved, That to support or countenance that Atheism by sustaining its priesthood, or worshipping at any of its altars, from Orthodox Congregationalists to Heterodox Universalism, so long as they render support to this government and Union, by voting or taking office under the Constitution, is treason and blasphemy to the government of God; and no person, who, at this late period, is guilty of such support and countenance, has any just claim to the name of abolitionist.

Loring Moody offered the following:

Resolved, That the anti-slavery cause is the most noble and philanthropic that has ever engaged the attention of mankind; and though now despised and hated, and though all manner of evil is spoken falsely against its advocates, the time shall soon come when it shall receive, as it now justly merits, the admiration and support of the wise and good throughout the civilized world.

Resolutions were offered by D. Otis, in condemnation of the Mexican war, and by C. L. Remond, in relation to pro-slavery churches, but they are not in possession of the Secretary.

The discussions throughout were of a most animated character, and were conducted chiefly by Frederick Douglass, C. L. Remond, Parker Pillsbury, Nath. H. Whiting, Loring Moody, Ichabod Morton, and Richard Thayer.

The Society voted to hold its next quarterly meeting at South Bridgewater, on the first Saturday and Sunday in October.

Also, voted to co-operate in a celebration of West India Emancipation on the first of August, at Abington. [Altered to Dorchester.]

On motion of Mr. Pillsbury, it was voted that the proceedings of the meeting be published in the Liberator, and that the publishers of newspapers in Plymouth be respectfully desired to give the resolutions that were passed, an insertion in their papers. Ad-journed.

#### ANNIVERSARY OF WEST INDIA EMANCIPATION AT DORCHESTER

This most important and auspicious event will be celebrated by a picnic gathering at TENTAX GROVE, near Neponset village in DORCHESTER, on Saturday, July 31st.

The friends of freedom and the foes of slavery from far and near, are invited to participate in the efforts and pleasures of the occasion. Those will be present who can ably set forth the results of emancipation in the West Indies, and eloquently present the duty and policy of our country immediately to emancipate every slave in the land.

Let there be a large and effective meeting. For the particulars next week.

In behalf of the Mass. Anti-Slavery Society, SAMUEL MAY, Jr.  
General Agent.

#### ANNUAL MEETING.

One of the largest and most interesting meetings ever held in the County, was held by the Old Colony A. S. Society, at the Christian Baptist meeting-house in Plymouth, on Saturday and Sunday, the 3d and 4th inst. Numerous delegations were present from all parts of the county, and the people of the town crowded the spacious meeting-house to its utmost capacity most of the time, especially in the evenings and on Sunday.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Rev. Elmer Hewitt, and Samuel Dyer was appointed Secretary pro tem. On motion, a committee on nomination of officers was chosen, consisting of Bourne Spooner, Edward E. Bennett, and Lewis Ford, who subsequently reported the following list of officers for the ensuing year:

President—Elmer Hewitt, of Hanson.

Vice Presidents—Seth Sprague of Duxbury, Bourne Spooner of Plymouth, Samuel Dyer of Abington, Melzar Sprague of Hanson, Daniel Otis of Scituate.

Secretary and Treasurer—Henry H. Brigham of Abington.

Managers—Lewis Ford and Briggs Arnold of Abington, Mrs. Joshua Perry and Edward Y. Perry of Hanson, and Rufus Bates of Hanover.

Bourne Spooner and Lewis Ford were chosen a committee on finance.

The following resolution was offered by Richard Thayer:

Whereas, the people of this Commonwealth propose to commemorate the achievement of American Independence, by appropriate public ceremonies, on the 5th instead of the 4th of July, because the latter comes on what they regard as peculiarly the Lord's day; therefore,

Resolved, That their conduct, in this respect, is a libel on the sentiment which obtains among them, that God was in a peculiar sense the author of that achievement.

The following resolution was moved by Loring Moody, and, after a spirited discussion by Messrs. Moody, Remond, Douglass, Whiting, Pillsbury, and Morton, was laid on the table:

Resolved, That the slaves in this nation have far greater cause to rise in forcible resistance to their masters, and obtain their liberty by planting their foot on the prostrate form of their oppressors, than the fathers of this republic ever had, under the colonial bondage of Great Britain.

The following were offered by Parker Pillsbury, and, after a long and earnest discussion, adopted:

Resolved, That the present declining state of American Atheism, so long sustained by the name of Christianity, is cause of rejoicing to every friend of truth and humanity; inasmuch as, under it, and by it, millions are enslaved, multitudes of Indians and Mexicans are murdered and plundered of their lands, polygamy is endorsed and practised, and every description of abomination is or may be perpetrated, under the specious doctrine of 'organic sin,' revealed and published by our Doctors of Divinity.

Resolved, That to support or countenance that Atheism by sustaining its priesthood, or worshipping at any of its altars, from Orthodox Congregationalists to Heterodox Universalism, so long as they render support to this government and Union, by voting or taking office under the Constitution, is treason and blasphemy to the government of God; and no person, who, at this late period, is guilty of such support and countenance, has any just claim to the name of abolitionist.

Loring Moody offered the following:

Resolved, That the anti-slavery cause is the most noble and philanthropic that has ever engaged the attention of mankind; and though now despised and hated, and though all manner of evil is spoken falsely against its advocates, the time shall soon come when it shall receive, as it now justly merits, the admiration and support of the wise and good throughout the civilized world.

Resolutions were offered by D. Otis, in condemnation of the Mexican war, and by C. L. Remond, in relation to pro-slavery churches, but they are not in possession of the Secretary.

The discussions throughout were of a most animated character, and were conducted chiefly by Frederick Douglass, C. L. Remond, Parker Pillsbury, Nath. H. Whiting, Loring Moody, Ichabod Morton, and Richard Thayer.

The Society voted to hold its next quarterly meeting at South Bridgewater, on the first Saturday and Sunday in October.

Also, voted to co-operate in a celebration of West India Emancipation on the first of August, at Abington. [Altered to Dorchester.]

On motion of Mr. Pillsbury, it was voted that the proceedings of the meeting be published in the Liberator, and that the publishers of newspapers in Plymouth be respectfully desired to give the resolutions that were passed, an insertion in their papers. Ad-journed.

SAMUEL DYER, Sec. pro tem.

FRIEND GARRISON—Enclosed, I send you the proceedings of the anti-slavery meeting at Plymouth, for insertion in the Liberator. You will observe a vote was passed relative to a 1st of August celebration in this town; but I have since learned that Dorchester is to be the place. Under all the circumstances, considering the recent Convention in this town, and the late meeting at Plymouth, I think the friends in this vicinity will readily acquiesce in the decision of the Board.

The proceedings of the Convention in this town have not appeared in the Liberator. Perhaps it is unnecessary, at this late day. Of course, you will do as you think proper.

Yours, SAMUEL DYER.

S. Abington, July 11, 1847.

\* Those proceedings were transmitted to us, but we have accidentally mislaid them.—Ed. Lib.

MIKE WALSH.

BRO. GARRISON—I think it one of the most lamentable facts that have developed themselves of late, that such a base, black-hearted wretch as Mike Walsh should stand at the head of the working-men's party of New-York. It is more lamentable to my mind, than it would be to know that all the other parties combined had such wretches for their leaders. As a laboring man, I protest against such miscreants calling themselves friends of the working-men. They are mere vipers, which, if nourished in our bosoms, will sting us to death, or reduce us to a state worse than death—chattel slavery.

Yours for the oppressed,

JOSEPH MERRILL.  
Danvers, New-Mills, Mass., June 27th, 1847.

R. F. Wallcut, Anti-Slavery Office, 21 Cornhill.

#### THE LIBERATOR.

American Slaveholders.—The Cork Examiner of Monday announces the arrival of a fine schooner, called the William Dugan of New York, bringing a large cargo of bread stuffs (216 tons) and clothing for the relief of the destitute in this country. It has been consigned for distribution to the Society of Friends.—Boston Atlas.

#### THE FOURTEENTH NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY BAZAAR.

TO BE HELD IN BOSTON,  
During Christmas and New Year's Week, 1847-8.

In the same number of the Atlas, we find the following paragraph:

The British brig Seraph, with 118 passengers, was ordered away, no one being willing to bond them, but she still remains below, having a fever very sick. One death occurred on Friday, the pilot presented him, to go on board, on Friday, the passengers presented him, being determined to go on shore. The acting British Consul visited the vessel on Friday evening, and supplies were sent down from the city.

What can be more disgraceful to the city than this? Truly, the regard shown for the starving millions in Ireland is of a very paradoxical character. One day a vessel is heavily freighted with breadstuffs and clothing to send across the Atlantic to Ireland, to feed the hungry and cover the naked; and the next, a vessel arrives in our harbor from Ireland, with a portion of those who have escaped for their lives, and she is 'ordered away,' because of the discrepancy between American principle and American practice; or responsibility for keeping pure the sources of public morals; or desire to lay deep in the national conscience, the foundations of future generations.

After a deep and careful examination of ways and means for the peaceful abolition of slavery, it has been found hopeless, except through the consent of the majority of the whole people. This obtained, the work is done; for the willing can readily find a way. Sound judgment in the choice of means, and the best economy in their expenditure, alike forbid us, therefore, to enter into the partisan or sectarian schemes, by which the purposes of any one of the various political and theological persuasions will be subserved at the expense of the cause of Freedom, while all others are alienated from it in the same proportion.

Menaces—The slaves constitute the largest portion of the population now, a free and remunerated labor force, the soul of our island commerce, and, as such, are the wealth of the merchants. Let us look back at the commercial revolution which has taken place in Trinidad since the dawn of freedom. The signs of comparative wealth among the laboring people everywhere appear. The great change in their condition has greatly stimulated trade of every description. Merchant trades of every class have increased a hundred fold above the lower order of society; these are rapidly rising in respectability and wealth, and promise at no distant day to play an important part in the internal trade and affairs of the colony. In consequence of the possession of money by the people, our island imports have increased to a most surprising extent, in the course of a few years.—Trinidad Spectator.

Effects of Negro Emancipation.—The Sangamo Journal contains full reports of the debates and votes.

Mr. Bond, on the 24th ult., offered a resolution pro-

moting a separate article, forever prohibiting free colored persons from settling in the State, and preventing owners of slaves from settling their free

in Illinois, under effective penalties. Mr. Brockman

said that the colored people would have no rights in

common with the citizens of Illinois. Mr. Adams

tried to get rid of the resolution, by moving that the

Legislature should have no power to pass laws to op-

press the colored people. Mr. Pinckney declared

that some of the recently passed State laws aga-

inst the colored people were unconstitutional.

Mr. Norton said that to exclude free negroes was

an infringement of the United States Constitution,

they being citizens. Mr. Kinney said that free per-

sons of color were a great pest to society. Mr. Da-

vis had been born and reared in a slave State, had

owned slaves, and yet regarded slavery as an evil.

He was opposed to Mr. Bond's resolution. Mr. Sin-

gleton would not have Illinois made a receptacle of

all the worthless, superannuated negroes that slave-

owners might choose to send. Mr. Geddes liked the

resolution to exclude negroes, but the people might

not like it—let us not endanger the adoption of the

Constitution. If they were here as a Legislative

body, he would vote for such a proposition. [In that

case, the people would have to bear it, having no

means to stand up to it—CRIME.]

This money will, in short, be spent neither in com-

pensation, colonization, nor political partisanship;

while a clear-sighted economy will also forbid its

being used as an effectual channel of a vigilance committee.

It will be spent in Propagandism—for we strike openly,

boldly, strongly, and successfully too, as our four

years of labor prove, at the root of the system we

mean to abolish.

Finally, we appeal to our friends and countrymen

to take part in this holy cause, as to frail and suf-

fering and short-lived fellow-creatures. It shall

strengthen them in weakness, comfort in affliction,

and steel against calamity. It shall save them from

the sin of living on the side of the oppressor, and

## POETRY.

From 'The People's Journal,' for June.

## CLEON AND I.

By CHARLES MACKAY.

Cleon hath a million acres—  
Never a one have I;  
Cleon dwelleth in a palace—  
In a cottage I;  
Cleon hath a dozen fortunes—  
Not a penny I;  
But the poorer of the twain, is  
Cleon, and not I.

Cleon, true, possesseth acres,  
But the landscape 1;  
Half the charms to me it yieldeth—  
Money cannot buy;  
Cleon harbors sloth and dulness—  
Freshening vigor 1;  
He in velvet, I in fustian,  
Richer man am I.

Cleon is a slave to grandeur—

Free as thought am I;

Cleon fees a score of doctors—

Need of none have I;

Wealth-surrounded, care-envir'd,

Cleon fears to die;

Death may come, he'll find me ready—

Happier man am I.

Cleon sees no charms in Nature—

In a daisy 1;

Cleon hears no anthems ringing

In the sea and sky.

Nature sings to me for ever—

Earnest listener I:

State for state, with all attendants,

Who would change?—Not I.

From Howitt's Journal, for June.

## WHICH IS THE M. N?

By EDWARD TOLK.

I see its pins, and chains, and rings,  
Its eye-glass, and its trumpet things;—  
I see its whiskers—they are fine  
Ornaments in the hairy line;  
I see its coat; I see its hat;  
I see its boots, and its cravat.—  
Such a thing you chance to meet,  
Sauntering up Regent Street,  
The tailor prides who makes such suits,  
And praise the art of such boots.

II.

I do not see his shabby dress;—  
I see his axe; I see his spade;  
I see a man that God has made;—  
If such a man before you stand,  
Give him your heart, give him your hand,  
And praise your Maker for such men;—  
They make this old earth young again.

## THE THREE VOICES.

What saith the Fast to thee? Weep!

Truth is departed!

Beauty hath died like the dream of a sleep,

Love is faint-hearted;

Trifles of sense, the profoundly unreal,

Scarce from our spirits God's holy ideal—

So, as a funeral bell, slowly and deep,

So tolls the Fast to thee! Weep!

How speaks the Present hour? Act!

Walk, upward glancing;

Shall thy footsteps in glory be tracked,

Slow, but advancing.

Scorn not the smallness of daily endeavor;

Let the great meaning enoble it ever;

Droop not o'er efforts expended in vain;

Work, as believing that labor is gain.

What doth the Future say? Hope!

Turn thy face sunlight!

Look where the light fringes the far rising slope—

Day cometh onward.

Watch! Though so long be twilight delaying,

Let the first sunbeam arise on these praying;

Fear not, for greater is God by thy side,

Than armies of Satan against thee allied.

III.

## GIVE! GIVE!

By GEORGE H. CALVERT.

The Sun gives ever; so the Earth,  
What it can give, so much 't is worth.

The Ocean gives in many ways,—

Gives paths, gives fishes, rivers, bays.

So, too, the Air, it gives us breath;

When it stops giving, comes in Death.

Give, give, be always giving;

Who gives not is not living.

The more you give,

The more we live.

## PREACH THE TRUTH.

Fear ye not the face of clay—

Preach the truth—

It will spring another day,

If you're faithful,

And the holy Word obey.

What if scorning men oppose?

Preach the truth,

To your friends and to your foes;—

If you're faithful,

These will yield as well as those.

With the message from the skies,

Preach the truth,

To the foolish and the wise—

If you're faithful,

Vice will sink, and virtue rise.

If men hear or men forbear,

Preach the truth;—

Truth is never lost in air;

If you're faithful,

You a crown of life shall wear.

## ANTITHESIS.

By M. T. W. CHANDLER.

When thou, dear child, wrapt in unconscious sleep,  
Within my circling arms the form didst lay,  
From troubled rest I oft would start and weep,  
And dream some power had borne thee far away.

Pale with affright, and trembling with my fears,

I woke—to find thee slumbering on my heart;

And with a gush of warm and grateful tears,

I had the visionary dread depart.

But now, when sinking to my lonely rest,  
Brooding o'er mem'ries of thine infant charms,  
In my false dreams, I'll lull thee o'er my breast;

And fold thee, soft and warm, within mine arms.

Who, then, shall tell the anguish of my soul,

When the chill morning cometh—bleak and lone—

When the sweet spell which o'er my senseless slate,

Bath vanished, and I wake—to find thee gone!

—We take no note of time but from its loss;

To give it then a tongue is wise in man.

## REFORMATORY.

## MASONIC TRADITIONS.

MR. EDITOR.—In the Boston Journal of June 25th, edited by Messrs. Sleeper & Rogers, appeared a minute and extended account of a masonic celebration at Worcester, the day previous, June 24, 1847, from their correspondent B., who says this 24th day of June, 'being masonically reckoned the natal day of its ancient friend and brother, St. John the Baptist,' who, with St. John the Evangelist, is the patron saint of Freemasonry. The two saint Johns, according to masonic tradition and record, were zealous members of the order, and their devotion to its principles, and practical application of its tenets, early endeared them to the brethren, and caused their names to be handed down to posterity as the patron saints of the order.'

On seeing this, your humble servant offered for publication, the next day, in the Boston Journal, the following:

MESSRS. EDITORS—I have often asked what authority have Freemasons for claiming St. John the Baptist, and St. John the Evangelist, as patrons of Freemasonry; but no one I have found, who could answer the question. As your correspondent B. from Worcester, the 24th inst., seems to know more than any other man I have come across, on this subject, I hope he will have the goodness to inform me where he finds any evidence in the received histories of ancient or modern times, or in sacred history, that the St. Johns ever knew or said anything about Freemasonry. The evidence seems to me clear and conclusive, although negative, that if they were patrons of masonry, they would have said something about it in the New Testament; but not a word. They were Christians, and all mankind their brethren—not a select few. If there be a single word or sentence in all the scriptures that recognizes Freemasonry, or any other secret societies, I shall be thankful to have it pointed out. Mr. B. says it is 'Masonic tradition and record, that the St. Johns were zealous members of the order'; and can he say, this is truthful history? I must say, I am distrustful of Masonic traditions. For this distrust, I will give my reasons any time when he requires them. I enquire where and when this tradition commenced, and on what authority, and where is the 'record.'

JUN 29, 1847.

Here follows the notice which Messrs. Sleeper &amp; Rogers take of Quero's communication:

MR. WE yesterday published a letter from a friendly correspondent, giving a sketch of the doings at the late Masonic celebration at Worcester. A correspondent in this city, in a communication which we received to-day, takes exception to some passages in the letter, calls for authorities, and seems desirous of entering into a controversy with the author on the general subject of Masonry. We inserted the letter, believing it to contain an interesting description of a celebration which would give pleasure to many of our subscribers, and free from all manner which could justly be regarded as offensive, or calculated to provoke a discussion—for a controversy on this subject, and which the publication of the communication would inevitably produce, is one of those things which we would at all hazards avoid.

Quero's communication was offered with a sincere

desire to get some direct information to awake attention to what is called the anniversary of St. John

the Baptist, that Masons themselves might reflect

and consider whether they have not assumed too

much, whether some Masonic traditions may not be

baseless; also that non-masons might examine whether their credulity has not been too long and too much abused.

I did not doubt but it would be readily in-

serted as an act of fairness and impartiality, and

from a desire to elicit truth. Not a suspicion or

thought arose in my mind, whether the editors were

masons. It would have occupied but little more

room than their observations on rejecting it. If they

dreaded an expected controversy, they could have

said, their columns from thence would be closed to

it. It is very evident that the 'friendly correspondent'

of Worcester was a Freemason; and from the disini-

gation on the part of the editors to touch the sub-

ject, one or both have taken the oath to 'ever con-

ceal and never reveal,'—to not write, print, stamp,

etc.' The writers, they say, 'would give pleasure to many of our subscribers.' In this way, a 'friendly correspondent' may say anything of Freemasonry, and an anti-mason, even if a subscriber to the Journal, could not be allowed a protest. In this the editors appear good and loyal subjects. They have been obedient to the mandate, the dignified silence of the late Edward Livingston, Grand High Priest of the General Grand Royal Arch Chapter of the United States.

In his letter from Worcester, B. says—'I could

not but notice the preponderance of aged members

over the middle-aged and young—many who tottered

and stooped as they walked—men who had fought

the battles of masonry in their youth, when desola-

tion sat in their courts, and lamentations filled her

halls, because of her persecutions, now lived by her

sacred principles in their after life; after she had come

from the furnace of trial—unscathed; after she had

been weighed in the balance, and found not want-

ing.'

It is now very apparent that B. knew to whom he

could say 'Mash-ha-bone.' He knew well, who

would echo his bountiful and fraternal congratula-

tions.

It seems to be preposterous and foolish to waste

arguments and censure on what is so absurd and un-

founded; but to pass over such assumptions in sil-

ence is the helping to make, rather than to unmake

masonic traditions. Some lament the wickedness,

and let them pass in sorrow; others laugh at them,

consoling themselves that folly and falsehood in one

thing cannot live forever. Some one bold mason-

ic orator declares something without evidence;

another, at some future anniversary, in a distant

part of the country, repeats the same thing, having

the first declaration as his authority; thus it be-

comes masonic tradition. By such and not better au-

thority can it be said that the saint Johns were 'the

zealous members of the order of Freemasons.' Thus

it was said that all the Major Generals in our revolu-

tionary army were masons, excepting Benedict Arn-

old; but, fortunately, this was found to be a false

evidence. The record was found that he was made

a mason at New-Haven, April 15, 1765, R. W. Na-

than Whiting, Master. And on no better authority,

probably, has it been said by some zealous mason,

that 52 of the 56 signers of the declaration of in-

dependence were masons. If Mr. B. at Worcester

will call on his neighbor ex-Governor Lincoln, he

can be informed of a masonic falsehood on the plain-

dealing of which they fear to disclose, unembarrassed

by promises which they know not how conscienti-

ously to perform!

## VALUABLE PUBLICATION.

## THE RIOT AT ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND.

Baltimore, July 6, 1847—9 A. M.

We regret to learn that a most